

Mid East

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400010048-9

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE 6 NOV 72

PAGE 2

Soviets Said to Know Arabs Planned Attack

Reuter

The Soviet Union knew in advance the Arabs planned to attack Israel, a top U.S. Defense Department official indicated yesterday.

Deputy Secretary of Defense William Clements was questioned before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee about whether the Soviet Union knew in advance of the Arab attack.

He replied he could not say specifically, but added pointedly: "It is sufficient to say the sealift (of new Soviet military supplies) arrived si-

multaneously with the outbreak of hostilities."

He added that it normally took 10 days to two weeks for ships loaded in Soviet ports with military equipment to reach Egypt and Syria.

Asked who started the fighting, he replies: "There is no question at all about that. The hostilities were started by Egypt and Syria attacking at the same time."

Clements also said Israel has indicated it needs nearly \$3 billion worth of military equipment as a result of the recent fighting.

He was testifying on a bill to supply Israel with \$2.2 billion worth of military equipment to replace supplies lost in the war.

An administration spokesman told the committee the military equipment would be tangible evidence of American support for Israel and would help set the stage for Middle East peace negotiations.

In other testimony, Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth Rush said approval of the assistance would be proof of the U.S. commitment to Israel and would help achieve a negotiated settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The United States must maintain the military balance in the area, he said.

"It is our conviction," Rush stated, "that negotiations leading to a peace settlement, which we are now hoping to arrange, will encounter serious difficulty should there develop a situation in which one side is apprehensive about its security."

"The requested emergency appropriations would enable the U.S. government to assist Israel in meeting its security needs," he said.

Pentagon Unalarmed By Soviet Presence

United Press International

The Pentagon said yesterday that up to 2,000 Soviet marines in ships designed for beach landings are stationed in the Mediterranean. But a spokesman said there was no cause for alarm.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) said Sunday there were Soviet marines in the Mediterranean. In response, Pentagon spokesman William Beecher said the Russians normally have two landing ships in the Mediterranean, but now have eight, which could carry from 200 to 2,000 marines or naval infantry.

"This is not viewed with unusual alarm," Beecher said. "They are not a substantial number if you're talking about a militarily significant force."

The United States regularly stations one ship in the Mediterranean carrying a marine landing force of 1,800 men. A second ship with another 1,800 men was rushed to the Mediterranean after the Middle East war began.

As evidence of lessened tensions in the area, Beecher announced that U.S. Air Force planes with American markings and crews had flown into Egypt Sunday for the first time in recent memory, and that both Soviet and American ships on alert in the Mediterranean had pulled into ports for visits.

Mid East

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400010048-9

THE EVENING STAR

DATE 10 Nov 73

PAGE 10

Israel Weapons Aid Pushed

By George Sherman
Star-News Staff Writer

Israel has requested new American military equipment worth \$3 billion, but the Nixon administration believes "slightly over \$2 billion" will cover Israeli needs, according to Deputy Defense Secretary William P. Clements Jr.

In testimony before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee yesterday, both Clements and Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth R. Rush urged quick passage of the administration's emergency \$2.2 billion appropriation request for Israel and another \$200 million for Cambodia. Otherwise, said Clements, Israel will default payments for about \$1 billion in U.S. weapons and supplies already received or pledged since the latest Middle East war.

That equipment, said Clements, has gone under the credit provisions of the Military Sales Act allowing 120 days for repayment. Israel is already making time payments on a previous \$1.2 billion in arms purchases. Without this additional aid, said Clements, Israel cannot meet the \$1 billion now due in January-February.

RUSH REMINDED the subcommittee that 70 percent of the Senate and 60 percent of House members have previously called upon the U.S. government to support the Israeli "deterrent force" by "whatever means necessary."

Clements added the \$2.2 billion worth of equipment to come from U.S. stocks will actually cost the Department of Defense more, since those stocks must be replaced at current, inflated prices.

After the hearing, Rush told several newsmen that the original \$3 billion Israeli request was a "mushy figure," but the United States

will "probably" end up spending slightly over \$2 billion. In the original message to Congress Oct. 20 — two days before the first cease-fire, President Nixon named the \$2.2 billion as the maximum amount needed if the war were "prolonged."

Clements and Rush said President Nixon would have the authority under the legislation to determine how much of the aid would go in credit and how much in outright grants. Rush told newsmen that the first aid would go on credit, and grants would come later if Israel showed it is unable to sustain the financial strain.

CLEMENTS TOLD Sen. Daniel Inouye, D-Hawaii, chairman of the subcommittee, that since hostilities began Oct. 6 the Soviet Union has delivered 100,000 tons of supplies and weapons to Egypt and Syria. Soviet airlifts, he said, have ranged from 25 to 90 planes a day. Even before the war, he added, the Russians had given Syria, Egypt and Iraq \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion in military equipment.

"By some happy coincidence," said Clements, the Soviet sealift began arriving at Syrian and Egyptian ports "almost simultaneously with the outbreak of hostilities."

Compared with the 30 days taken by U.S. supplies to reach Israel by sea, he said, the Russians have only a "10-day cycle" in their shipments. After failing to persuade the Russians not to resupply, he said, the United States had an airlift of C141 and giant C5 air transports flying to Israel nine hours after the decision was taken to go ahead. Within three days, the American airlift had reached the daily average of 1,000 tons, he said.

Both Clements and Rush stressed that the \$2.2 billion has meant to Israel a sense of security at a time when Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger is trying to arrange negotiations on a compromise peace. Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, D-Minn., also testified yesterday that "direct negotiations" depend upon convincing the Soviet Union and the Arab world that "Israel cannot be overwhelmed by military force."

On Cambodia Rush and Clements said the \$200 million was needed mainly for extra ammunition. A new Communist offensive is expected in the forthcoming dry season, probably in December, both officials said. If the government survives that offensive, they said, the conditions would be set for a cease-fire

and perhaps a coalition government with the Khmer insurgents.

They said the first administration budget request of \$180 million for Cambodia is insufficient, because of increased enemy ground action after the American bombing halt voted by Congress Aug. 15.

The Cambodian armed forces are now consuming ammunition at between \$500,000 and \$1 million a day, said Clements. Of the new total of \$380 million now needed for the survival of Cambodia this fiscal year, Clements gave this breakdown: \$228 million for ammunition, \$59 million for equipment, \$48 million for operating and maintenance supplies, and \$45 million for the cost of delivery of materials.

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400010048-9

cleaned in cold water with a cold water cleaner. Finally, when you bathe, a shower uses generally less water than a bath.

LIGHTING

First. Take care of your eyes—but, most of us use more light than we really need to. It pays to turn off unnecessary lights and use natural light when possible. There is another interesting fact to remember: A fluorescent bulb uses one-sixth the energy of a conventional standard incandescent light bulb.

These procedures together with energy research to develop new forms of clean energy will move our country through this crisis. It is totally American to be provident and self-sufficient.

THE HEALTH RIPOFF WORSENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRASCO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, while the average American watches the front pages and evening news reports with growing alarm and apprehension, quietly and ominously, another situation, already serious, has grown still more out of hand. In the area of health care and costs, recent months have been marked by one increase after another. Cumulatively, the caveat reading "Don't Get Sick In America" is truer than ever before. It will cost you more and you will receive less. No worse personal tragedy can be envisioned for the overwhelming majority of American citizens. Worse still, it is being accelerated by a series of Government actions.

The national health insurance plan has been scrapped after all the early fanfare. The drive announced in 1972 to increase the number of doctors, dentists, and paramedics has foundered on an ocean of budget cuts insofar as Federal aid to medical and dental schools is concerned. The National Institutes of Health have been harmed down the line, with two exceptions, as a result of budget cutbacks. Bookkeeping legerdemain has substituted for actual dollars in the actual amounts being committed by the Government to these crucial areas.

Even the national commitment to HMO's, or health maintenance organizations, has been watered down after many promises to move ahead on such a comprehensive potential solution. Through it all, the dead hand of the American Medical Association has clutched at the sleeve of government attempting to prevent vigorous experimentation on behalf of the people.

The head of the President's war on cancer, Dr. Frank Rauscher, has publicly warned that the existing cancer budget will not allow the research work required to pursue leads which might result in the saving of untold numbers of lives. A number of promising programs are endangered by governmental parsimoniousness in these areas. Among these programs are some which are concerned with moving the latest improvements in the cancer area to the bedside of patients as swiftly as possible.

Impoundment has been used by the Government as yet another weapon in what incredibly emerges as a deliberate attempt to harm the total health care delivery system in the Nation. National defense education funds have been impounded and repeated attempts have been made by the Government to close down the eight Public Health Service hospitals, including one in the New York area. At a time like this, closing down any viable hospital care facility seems the negation of what we are trying to accomplish.

Even Government specialists in this area have publicly admitted that increases in medicare costs for the aged and termination of key programs are not realistic. As a result, projected savings of \$1.8 billion are not going to be realized, while much needless suffering is inflicted on many innocent Americans.

Most reprehensible of all are the attempts by Government to completely wipe out a series of essential and effective programs, such as community mental health centers, Hill-Burton hospital construction funds, and regional medical programs, all of which have scored resounding successes in delivering vital care and services to those requiring them.

When the Congress attempted to reverse this tide of negativism, it was rebuffed. For example, why in the name of all that is sensible was a \$185 million program, designed to improve emergency medical service across the Nation vetoed? The Government had listed this program as one of its priorities. Now it has been vetoed, and the veto has not been overridden. Here we have a vital, successful endeavor, which has saved uncounted lives, and could save many, many more.

Yet in recent weeks, the pace of negativism by Government in the health field has increased appreciably. One warning given was that all Government aid to health manpower education will be coming to an end as soon as possible. Yet we have an acknowledged and much bemoaned shortage of all kinds of trained health manpower. This is true of doctors, dentists, nurses and all other related fields. As a matter of sad fact, more than half of all doctors licensed to practice medicine in this country last year were foreign-born and trained. Foreign physicians, seeking high incomes, are abandoning practices in foreign lands and coming here. Yet we will not turn to and increase levels of assistance to increase our own supply of trained medical and related personnel. Recently, an HEW official of the highest rank publicly stated before the Association of American Medical Colleges that such aid was very much in jeopardy.

Last month the announcement was made that the Nation's 25 million elderly will have to pay \$84 toward their hospitalization commencing January 21, instead of the current \$72. This is more than double the \$40 paid by beneficiaries when the program began in 1966. The Cost of Living Council, humorously termed the watchdog of consumer inter-

ests, approved the move, which was announced by HEW.

Because of the change in the hospital deductible, the law also requires changes in amounts a beneficiary pays toward hospitalization care of more than 60 days or after hospital care in a skilled nursing home for more than 20 days.

What are the elderly people of the land going to do? Most of them live on fixed incomes, ravaged by growing inflation. Price hikes like this make a mockery of the increases in social security pushed through by the Congress. They eat away all the benefits we try to extend to them, making life even more frustrating and cruel to them. The few dollars for millions of them are the difference between a decent diet and hunger or malnutrition.

To compound the situation, the Cost of Living Council has now just approved proposed new price regulations for the health industry, which will allow hospital bills to rise another 9 percent annually. Although public comment is invited, no one seriously doubts that the proposals will drastically change between now and final January promulgation.

What we have now, then, is a cumulative series of setbacks for the public in the health areas. Fewer crucial segments of research will be pursued. Fewer special medical services beneficial to the public will be provided. And on all sides, while receiving less and less, the cost to the average user of health services will escalate, escalate and escalate again, with the older American bearing the brunt of all this.

Here is a syndrome which inevitably affects all of us eventually and inevitably. None can escape. It is for the Congress to have the courage to override the next veto of health care services and to insure that all such cuts and impoundments are prevented.

Impoundment is an artificial, unconstitutional method used by those who would arrogate unto themselves power not specifically granted to them by the law. Vetoes can and should be overridden when they harm the well being of the Nation. In both areas, all that is required is that Congress do its basic, essential job; protect the public interest. No one can tell me that allowing such services to be cut is responsible or in the public interest.

ISRAELI PRISONERS OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, sick and wounded Israeli prisoners of war remain in the hands of Egypt and Syria. They are being used and abused as political bargaining chips. This is an unconscionable situation. The Israelis have offered to conform to the Geneva Convention and exchange the sick and wounded prisoners they hold. Egypt and Syria refuse. The Israelis have permitted the International Red Cross to visit their prisoners. Egypt and Syria have not. Indeed, they have not yet, to my knowledge, released a complete list of Israeli

SAVE GASOLINE

First. Avoid using your automobile unnecessarily. Over 54 percent of all car trips are less than 5 miles. Consolidating your trips will cut down on your auto use. In addition, for years doctors have been telling us that walking is healthy. We should all learn to walk more. More of us should also consider using a bicycle—it is the most efficient way of getting around town.

Second. Take public transportation, where possible. Although schedules and routing are often inconvenient, the first

step to improvements is an interested ridership.

Third. Develop a car pool for commuting. Next time you are on the freeway, count the number of cars with only one rider. Better yet, count the number of cars with more than one rider. Car pooling is not only energy efficient, it is also economical and a good answer to the problems of freeway congestion and auto pollution.

EFFICIENT AUTOMOBILES

Gasoline for our automobiles accounts for over 14 percent of our national energy

budget. In recent years car efficiency has declined by over 20 percent—and only part of this reduction can be attributed to pollution controls. American automobiles have become heavier, more powerful, and loaded with optional equipment—and this all cuts down on mileage.

First. When buying an automobile, do not overestimate your auto needs. Excessive weight, optional equipment, and large engines all contribute to low gas mileage. The table below illustrates the annual gasoline costs of an inefficient automobile.

COST OF DRIVING A CAR FOR 1 YEAR (ASSUME 10,000 MILES)

Price per gallon	Miles per gallon											
	32	30	28	26	24	22	20	18	16	14	12	10
\$0.37	115.62	123.32	132.13	142.30	154.18	168.17	185	205.57	231.25	264.37	308.32	370
\$0.38	118.75	126.65	135.70	146.15	158.35	172.71	190	211.13	237.50	271.43	316.65	380
\$0.39	121.88	129.99	139.27	149.99	162.51	177.26	195	216.68	243.75	278.58	324.99	390
\$0.40	125.00	132.32	142.84	153.84	166.68	181.80	200	222.24	250.00	285.72	333.32	400
\$0.41	128.13	135.65	146.41	157.67	170.85	186.35	205	227.80	256.25	292.86	341.65	410
\$0.42	131.25	138.99	149.98	161.53	175.01	190.89	210	233.35	262.50	300.01	349.99	420
\$0.43	134.38	142.32	153.55	165.30	179.18	195.44	215	238.71	268.75	307.15	358.32	430
\$0.44	137.50	145.65	157.12	169.22	183.35	199.98	220	244.46	275.00	314.29	366.65	440
\$0.45	140.63	148.99	160.70	173.07	187.52	204.53	225	250.02	281.25	321.44	374.99	450
\$0.46	143.75	153.32	164.77	178.92	193.68	209.07	230	255.58	287.50	328.58	383.32	460
\$0.50	156.25	166.65	178.55	192.30	208.35	227.25	250	277.80	312.50	357.15	416.65	500
\$0.60	187.50	199.98	214.26	230.76	250.02	272.70	300	333.36	375.00	428.58	499.98	600

Second. When you drive, keep your car tuned and your tires inflated. When you replace your tires, think about radial tires. They generally improve gas mileage by as much as 10 percent.

Third. After starting your engine, warm it up while moving. An idling car is getting zero miles per gallon. In addition, shut off your car if you are stopped for over a minute or so.

Fourth. Do not become overly dependent on your air-conditioner. Under extreme conditions, air-conditioning can waste up to 20 percent of your gasoline. Use it only when you really need it. Also think about setting the thermostat a little higher than normal.

IN THE HOME

First. Proper insulation will not only save you money in winter; it will also make your home easier to keep cool in the summer. The exact amount of insulation depends on the climate. But a good rule of thumb can be found in this table:

SOURCE OF HEAT	R (in inches)	
	Gas or oil	Electric
Wall insulation thickness	3 1/2	3 1/2
Ceiling insulation thickness	3 1/2-6	6-9

In checking the insulation of your home, pay particular attention to uninsulated attic floors. Here insulation can be installed easily in most cases.

Second. A recent study by the Department of Housing and Urban Development revealed that the greatest loss of heat from a house comes ordinarily through the infiltration of outside air. To cut down on this heat loss, install storm windows and doors where possible. A less expensive way to insulate windows is to seal them with clear plastic sheeting. Plastic sheeting will also

help in attic insulation. Heat leaks can also be prevented by using caulking and weatherstripping around windows and unused doors.

Third. Close drapes and shades in unoccupied rooms and during exceptionally cold periods. This will minimize heat loss through windows—but even on the coldest day, the sun shining through a window can help heat the room.

Fourth. A properly serviced heating system is more efficient and saves fuel.

Fifth. Set your thermostat lower in the winter. A one degree reduction can reduce fuel consumption from 3 to 4 percent. Reducing the setting by 5 degrees—say from 75 to 70 degrees—will save you 15 to 20 percent.

Sixth. Lower the thermostat at night.

Seventh. Close the damper of your fireplace if you are not using it.

Eighth. When buying a home try to remember these facts: An additional investment in energy efficiency will be more than paid back in lower fuel costs over the life of the house. Make sure your new home is properly insulated and is equipped with efficient heating and cooling systems.

Shortly, solar heating will be able to provide reliable, economical, and pollution-free energy. In buying a house, consider the adaptability of the roof and grounds to this coming new technology.

SAVINGS ON APPLIANCES

First. Check the efficiency of the appliances you buy. The Commerce Department is requesting that manufacturers voluntarily list the efficiency of their products. One way to insure that this program is successful is through consumer pressure for full disclosure of the energy costs of operating an appliance.

Second. A recent survey of air conditioners shows how important efficiency can be. Appliance manufacturers, in an effort to cut initial costs, often build inefficient products. For example, today there are over 1,400 models of air condi-

tioners on the market sold under 52 different brand names. The least efficient unit consumes 2.6 times more electricity per unit of cooling than the most efficient.

A convenient way to check the efficiency of the model you plan to buy is to divide the number of watts listed on the label into the Btu's per hour rating. The answer will vary ordinarily between 3 and 11. The higher the number, the more efficient the unit. A number around 7 is considered good.

Third. Defrost your refrigerator when the ice on the wall becomes one-fourth inch thick. A thick ice coating cuts down on the efficiency of the cooling coils of the freezer. When buying a new refrigerator, keep in mind that a self-defrosting model consumes 50 percent more energy than a standard model.

In addition, every time you open the refrigerator door, up to 80 percent of the cold air is lost.

Fourth. In selecting a freezer or refrigerator/freezer combination you should know that upright models are less efficient by as much as 45 percent.

COOKING

First. When cooking, use pots and pans that completely cover the heating element. Heat that is not directly under the pan is wasted. Also, remember that everytime you open the oven door 20 percent of the heat spills out.

WASHING

First. When washing clothes, always wash a full load; you save on the total number of washings that way. When drying your clothes, avoid overdrying—it uses fuel and tends to wrinkle your clothes.

Second. Try to cut down on your use of hot water. The thermostat on your water heater should be set between 110-140 degrees. Second, in washing dishes, wash them by hand in warm water, when possible. If you use a dishwasher, make sure you use a full load. Third, clothes can be

November 8, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 9783

prisoners they hold. Instead they have issued a series of public and private assurances which are so far little more than rhetoric. Rhetoric is no comfort to the men waiting in misery behind enemy lines or to their families waiting at home in the awful agony of not knowing.

On October 29 I wrote to Secretary of State Kissinger to urge that he raise these issues with the Arab nations. He has since assured me, as has Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco, that the U.S. Government has and will continue to press for the humane treatment and speedy release of prisoners in conformance with the Geneva Convention. Congress has the responsibility to add its voice and the weight of its influence to the sum of world opinion that these negotiations progress swiftly, that Egypt and Syria forthwith live up to their legal and moral obligations as set forth by the Geneva Convention, and that the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners begin at once.

Today I am introducing a resolution calling for Egypt and Syria to heed the terms of the Geneva Convention of August 1, 1949, with regard to prisoners of war, and for Egypt and Syria to accede to Israel's offer of an immediate exchange of prisoners among the countries. I urge my colleagues to join me in this humanitarian appeal.

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas the International Red Cross has not been given permission to visit Israeli prisoners of war in Egypt and Syria; and Whereas the governments of Egypt and Syria have not provided the International Red Cross with requested information about the names and condition of the prisoners they hold; and

Whereas the governments of Egypt and Syria have refused to release seriously sick Israeli prisoners of war; and

Whereas the above actions by the governments of Egypt and Syria are in violation of international legal obligations provided for in the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949; and

Whereas the government of Israel has complied with the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949 by allowing the International Red Cross to visit Egyptian and Syrian prisoners of war; by supplying the International Red Cross with lists of the prisoners it holds; and by offering the immediate release of seriously sick Egyptian and Syrian prisoners of war in exchange for the immediate release of seriously sick Israeli prisoners of war; and

Whereas the government of Israel has offered to comply with any reasonable plan for mutual exchange of prisoners between Israel, Egypt, and Syria; and

Whereas the American people are shocked and disturbed by reports of maltreatment of Israeli prisoners of war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the Executive branch of the American Government continue its efforts to ensure that the International Red Cross be allowed to visit Israeli prisoners of war in Egypt and Syria as required by the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949; and that the governments of Egypt and Syria provide the International Red Cross with information required by the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949; and that the governments of Egypt and Syria immediately release all seriously sick prisoners of war in exchange for Israeli release of all seriously sick prisoners of war as required under the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949; and that an immediate

exchange of prisoners between Israel, Egypt and Syria be negotiated.

SLOVAK DAY, 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues an address given recently by Dr. Michael Novak at the Slovak Day celebration at Roduljub Park in Johnstown, Pa. Dr. Novak is currently a consultant for the humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation in New York and has demonstrated through his speaking and writing his belief in the need for a political and educational revolution in the United States.

While he inspired Americans of Slovak descent to greater efforts to obtain positions of responsibility and influence in this address, Dr. Novak also focused on some general comments on government which should be of interest to all of us.

In the light of the current uncertainty in our Government his words are especially timely:

It is wrong in a democracy, merely to trust the government. Governments must be watched. Governments are not made to be trusted, but to be made accountable.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Novak's speech in its entirety follows, a stirring reminder of the responsibility of each citizen for the path his country takes.

SLOVAK DAY, 1973

Just one hundred years ago began one of the greatest mass movements of human history. Over thirty million Europeans exited from the doors of their homes and fled toward America. There were then over two million Slovaks in that beautiful land of Central Europe, around the lakes in the Tatra Mountains, in sight of ancient castles, in the mountains and rolling hills beyond Bratislava. Over two million Slovaks—of whom more than one-third felt obliged to leave their homes. After a thousand years of endurance, from the time of the first King of Central Europe, the Slovak, Svatopluk, in 893; after a thousand years of assassination and murder and plunder at the hands of Attila, Genghis Khan, the Turks, and in every century others; after a thousand years of bravery, family love, and a longing for independence and peace—one out of every three Slovaks bade good-bye to the mountains they loved, the partents who had nourished them, brothers and sisters, friends—and they fled for Argentina, for Canada, and for America.

The great industrialists of America wanted Slav laborers. They respected them as hard workers, tougher than others perhaps, more reliable, more docile, and better able to make do with less. They wanted Slav labor in order to bring wages down and to keep the workers of America divided. Remember, for example, that the black people of America were first freed from slavery not long after many of our ancestors were freed from serfdom—in 1863. One hundred years ago, many of those blacks who fled north were just beginning to find jobs. The white American workers were just beginning to rebel against the great industrialists—the first great labor union strikes were just beginning. This was the jungle into which our grandparents were brought. It was part of a policy of "Divide and Conquer." Put national group against national group. The wealthy got wealthier.

Think of the families that own the mines and mills and the lands of America. How staggeringly rich many are. All across America, in valley after valley, place after place, there are one or two families of predominant power and wealth. The American system is more like the system of Europe than we realize—we have our barons, dukes, and lords—the owners of television stations, newspapers, and the owners of the politicians, too.

Remember, too, the lives our people led in America. For working twelve hours in a mine, six or seven days a week, a man might take 20 cents a day, and find himself at the end of the month owing more to the company store than he had earned. Boys of 8 or 9, sometimes beaten with whips, stood at the colliery sorting slag from the coal. Six or eight persons slept in a room. At Latimer Mines, near Hazleton, in 1897, sheriff's deputies fired into a crowd of peacefully marching Slovak miners, with an American flag at their head. They were on strike. No one heard an order to disband. Many could not have understood an order in English in any case. When the seventy deputies—none of them Slavic—finished firing, twenty Slovaks and Poles lay dead, most shot in the back, and another thirty wounded. The Hungarian government protested; huge protests were held in New York and Chicago. Naturally, the deputies were acquitted.

In Connellsville, in Uniontown, and in Pittsburgh, Slovaks were shot down in strikes. In 1891, at Morewood, seven were shot. Two weeks later, in Fayette county, one Slovak man and one Slovak woman were shot, as workers were being evicted from company houses. In Adelaide the same day, two Slovak women were shot.

Why do I bring these sad events to mind? Because I do not wish to forget. Today we enjoy a happy picnic. Today, more and more in our generation are highly educated. Today, more and more among us are prosperous—not many rich, not many millionaires, not many among the powerful: on boards of directors, or high in government, or the military, or the corporate world. We are not among the powerful in America. But we have very much to be thankful for. And, if the truth be told, after so many years of disaster, perhaps we are happy not to be placed too high, so that sudden tragedy cannot make our fall too steep. Slovak people are known for a sort of modesty—content to live on little, if only they be free.

There is, the books say, a certain peaceableness about the Slovak character. A certain quiet, long-range optimism, borne of the knowledge that our people have seen worse than this—that, no matter how bad things get, we are familiar with disaster. Tragedy is our nation's brother. The Slovak people stood for over a thousand years under the attacks of invaders—always the invasions would recede, and the Slovak farms and towns and families would remain. Western Europe owes much of the peace and space it has enjoyed to the defenders of the Tatra mountains and the Danube, on which almost century after century new invaders from the East or South or North have spent themselves.

Today I want to remember all the suffering that brought us this place. Perhaps all of you have sharper memories than I. You remember the men going to the mines, and coming back. You remember the conditions in the mills. You remember the explosions. You remember the mangled fingers, the shattered knees. You remember the outbreaks of influenza. You remember the infants that used to die.

Above all, perhaps, you remember the prejudices there used to be against the Slavs. Even on the Statue of Liberty, the words that greeted the immigrants were: "Welcome—ye wretched refuse of the earth." In other words, ye garbage. I've always been

grateful my grandparents couldn't read English when they sailed into Ellis Island, the water lapping against the sides of those wooden or plated ships. And they were called other names: Huns, hunkies, etc. They were pictured in the newspaper cartoons as rats and apes. They were called scum, and it was said they were dirty and strange, and their women were black babuskas, and none of them were ready for democracy and they would lower the quality of the nation's blood.

We shall never forget, I believe, that this nation welcomed our grandparents and gave them a chance. We should never forget what they met when they got here, and what they did for us. . . .

But I don't only want to think about the past. My own thoughts are toward the present and the future. Why, in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, are Slavs so poorly represented among those of power and money and influence? Why have we still so few writers and artists and television personalities? Why don't we cut a greater mark than we do, periodically?

Do not misunderstand. I say these things gently, not in blame. Remembering where we were, we have come very far. And it takes time, even in a nation like this, to penetrate the places of power. And I do not mean for power's sake. It is not obvious that power makes people happy—or good—or admirable.

What I mean is that the nation needs some of the things our hearts tell us, some of the things our history has taught us. We are a people of enormous spiritual wealth, which our new nation needs.

What is our wealth? Above all, it is a sense of family, and home, and neighborhood. The Slovaks understand picnics like this—family picnics. Why is it, then, that the policies of our government and our corporations penalize families so much, rather than helping them? The great industries of this nation do not think first about the welfare of families. They do not design their factories, or their schedules, or their openings or their closings down with the good of families in mind. The government does not supervise medical costs or medical practices with the needs of families in mind. Almost everything in American life is distinctive of families. Keeping a good, healthy family is a full-time job—much harder than making money. America makes it easier for our people to make money than to keep healthy families.

America is a great danger for the Slovak people. It gives us money and wealth. Slovaks are not the richest Americans, by far. But when you look at the automobiles owned by every family here, they are better than the coaches Janosik used to rob—the coaches of the barons or dukes, in order to give to the poor.

In one more generation, the Slovak spirit may be dead in America. Soon, most of those who speak Slovak will be dead. Fewer and fewer of our young people know the history of Slovakia. I never learned about Slovakia in public schools or in college. . . . What about in the high schools of Johnstown, Uniontown, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland—what are our young people learning? What is becoming of them?

The Slovak people are so enormously trusting. They trust the government. They trust the universities. The schools. They obey the law. They pay their taxes. And they trust. After a thousand years of distrusting governments, in this country they began to trust. America has been good to our people. But we should not be deceived.

For over a thousand years, one thing held the Slovak people together—their love for their language. The Slovak language was the center of the life of the people. The Magyar tried to drive that language out of existence. Some 500 Slovaks were arrested in the 1870's, and put in jail, for speaking Slovak in public.

Now in America, in less than three genera-

tions, the language is disappearing. Knowledge of Slovak history is not taught. What the Magyar could not do with vinegar, America has done with sugar.

In the big cities, too, the leaders of government and industry abandoned the Slovak neighborhoods and churches. Visit these parishes today—isolated—alone—surrounded by factories or expressways or slums. People did not move out of these neighborhoods by accident. The policies of our government and industry drove them out—policies forcing people into the suburbs, making neighborhood life less attractive.

My purpose is not to lay blame. It is only to urge all to act with open eyes. It is wrong, in a democracy, merely to trust the government. Governments must be watched. Governments are not made to be trusted, but to be made accountable. In my opinion, the Slovak people in America have not been well served by the government.

When I look over the faces of this crowd, I wonder about all the stories your lives represent. Think of the history of your family over the last 100 years. What stories there are! What disaster, what war, what illnesses and accidents, what moments of luck and achievement.

Many of these stories will perish if we do not care for them. The world will never learn of them. We must try to get the historical societies and the universities and the high schools and the television stations and the newspapers to collect this material and to mind it. If you have old letters in your house, old newspapers, old books—do not destroy them. The Archives of Pennsylvania and universities need them. Please save things. Please get grandparents to tell or tape what they remember.

Secondly, we must put pressure on the schools. How many historians have told the story of the Slovak people (and other Slavs) in America? How many social scientists? How many literature courses teach Slovak children the novels of Thomas Bell (Belejck)? The universities belong to us. They should keep our traditions alive.

Thirdly, in politics, I beg you to think carefully. It does not seem to me that we Slovaks have yet made our mark in politics. We have not been as smart as we ought to be. We have been taken advantage of. Above all, we have not organized and shown really great political skills. We have to do better in the future. I'm not sure how. But let's at least keep our eyes open for young talent—push it—help it.

Leads me to young people—great to see so many young faces—long hair—short skirts—the things of youth and love and rebellion and song are very Slovak. Think of Janosik—he was visiting his girl friend when he was caught. . . .

Young people are different. Each generation is different. Immigration is a hundred-year story. We haven't even begun to make our contribution yet.

THE NASHVILLE BANNER'S "YOU DECIDE" IMPEACHMENT POLL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, over recent days there have been many measures of public sentiment on the subject of support for or against the President. My own mail and phone calls have run heavily against President Nixon. The latest count total as of this afternoon of letters and telegrams show 1,585 against and 125 for.

These figures are in no way a scientific sampling of the sentiment in my district. They do, however, reflect the

views of those who felt strongly enough about the issue to write or call their Congressmen.

Conversley, the Nashville Banner over recent days has been conducting a ballot poll on the same question and its findings run sharply contrary to my mail.

The Banner, also, makes no claim of scientific sampling and its publisher, Mr. Wayne Sargent, goes to very objective lengths to point this out.

Thus while neither the Banner's poll nor my mail may necessarily reflect true public sentiment on this issue—who is to say—both are of interest.

I feel the Banner poll findings to be quite interesting as well as the comments and story reporting them. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to place this material in the RECORD as this point and commend it to this consideration of my colleagues.

71 PERCENT IN "YOU DECIDE" POLL SAY "DON'T IMPEACH"

(By Larry Brinton)

President Nixon should not be impeached. That's the opinion of 71 per cent of the 5,434 readers of The Nashville Banner voting in this newspaper's new You Decide feature.

The question was "Should the President be impeached?" The vote was 3,878 against, 1,545 in favor and 11 undecided who mailed ballots anyway.

The President scored heavily on his domestic and foreign policies and his Vietnam War successes, according to ballot comments. However, many of those voting against impeachment were not nearly as concerned with that issue as they were in vehemently castigating those whom the voters felt responsible for Nixon's problems—mainly a biased news media and Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.).

CAN NO LONGER BE TRUSTED

The 1,545 persons voting for the President's impeachment in You Decide charged in their comments that the Chief Executive can no longer be trusted and has lost his ability to govern.

Told of the numerous detrimental comments made by the voters against Sen. Kennedy and asked for a comment, the Massachusetts Democrat's press secretary, Dick Drayne, in Washington, said:

"What did Sen. Kennedy have to do with the attempted subversion of the Department of Justice, CIA, FBI, Secret Service, Department of State and the U.S. Constitution? If you find Sen. Kennedy guilty of those sins, I'll be surprised. Those are Nixon Administration devices and he'll be judged on that basis."

There were some interesting facets about the You Decide balloting:

—The vote on the impeachment question closely paralleled the 69.5 per cent vote Nixon garnered statewide in the 1972 presidential election.

—Sixty-six per cent of the 5,314 ballot envelopes received by The Banner were mailed in Nashville. Votes were submitted from 50 Tennessee counties. There were some from Kentucky and one from Missouri.

—In November 1972, Davidson County voted 63 per cent for Nixon. The You Decide ballot showed 71 per cent against impeachment, with the majority of votes cast by Nashvillians. While the issue of electing a president and voting for impeachment are not the same, the distribution of votes indicates a probability that the President has increased rather than decreased his voter strength in Davidson County.

"We do not offer the results as a statistically perfect sample of voter opinion," explained Wayne Sargent, president and pub-

Joseph Alsop

Threats On Three Fronts

At the moment, Fidel Castro and his Cubans have thoughtfully prepared positions for the troops and artillery that would be needed to attack the historic American base in Cuba, Guantanamo Bay.

At the moment, again, it appears downright likely that the North Vietnamese will fairly soon tear up whatever remains of the truce agreement so painfully negotiated by Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger and Le Duc Tho. Hanoi's minimum objective, as indicated by massive military preparations in flat violation of the truce agreement, would appear to be tearing away from South Vietnam the northernmost quarter of the South's total territory, Military Region I.

At the moment, finally, there is still an all too serious chance of renewed war in the Middle East, with the Soviets actively aiding in the destruction of Israel. As those words are written, in fact, the intelligence community is given by an argument about why the Soviets have greatly diminished their airlift of supplies for the Arabs in the last couple of days. This could mean that the Kremlin has wished to cool off President Anwar Sadat and the Egyptian high command, so that they would negotiate more seriously with Secretary Kissinger. But it could also mean that the Kremlin wants to be ready for prompt intervention in a renewed Mideastern war, with the big Soviet air transports revved up on the southern Russian airfields where the Soviet airborne forces are now on alert.

In sum, you may be careless of the most solemn U.S. commitments in Southeast Asia; but you still have to begin your calculations with Israel's future, and to end at Guantanamo Bay. These ugly signs are in fact cited in inverse order of importance. For the Cubans are highly unlikely to use their prepared attack positions, unless this country has other, large troubles somewhere else.

You may also be in a righteous fever for President Nixon's impeachment. But you still have to include in your calculations the Watergate horror's hideous effect on the U.S. world position. All the foregoing threats are unquestionably Watergate-connected.

In truth, these ugly threats would either not exist, or they would not be such serious threats, if those making the threats had not begun to scent how badly Watergate has weakened the President, who has so often in the past proved his toughness and courage in threatening situations overseas. If you are in the currently fashionable fever of righteousness, you will, of course, say that if the President has been weakened, it is all his own fault. It is an arguable view.

But it is even more arguable that righteousness is less urgently important than the vital U.S. interests that are now threatened. So even the Congress and the famous media might well reflect a bit on what disasters may ensue for the American future, when you have public gloating in both Moscow and Hanoi because the President of



The Mideast



Vietnam



Guantanamo Bay

the United States has been politically crippled.

As a guide to the calculations above-suggested, it is best to take the most important case—which is of course the Middle East. Before these words can be printed, Secretary Kissinger may have pulled a negotiating rabbit out of the hat in Cairo. Pray God he manages to do so. But you have only to examine the alternative to see what desperate trouble this country is now in, partly because Watergate is now viciously interacting with our neglect of our power.

If there is renewed war, and the Soviets intervene, Israel is likely to be humbled and at least half-crushed. Yet if this horrible result is avoided, no more than a couple of years will be gained for the United States to gather

its wits again and to restore its lost standing of a serious giant power, by rearmament and in other ways.

The reasons for this bleak outlook are bleakly simple. The best imaginable settlement that Secretary Kissinger can negotiate will eventually involve Israeli withdrawal from most of a demilitarized Sinai, plus the subsequent re-opening of the Suez Canal. This best settlement will therefore permit the Soviets to pose as the Arabs' revenge-givers and to pour their ever-growing naval power into the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. For this, the Kremlin needs the canal re-opened.

Consider, then, the kind of states that own the crucial oil resources of the Arabian peninsula. The Soviets,

as revenge-givers, will have their impact, even in Saudi Arabia. They will have infinitely greater impact, however, if the rulers of Arab oil almost all wake up one morning to find themselves looking down the throats of scores of missile-launchers on Soviet guided missile cruisers, with one of the new Soviet aircraft carriers in the immediate offing as well.

In other words, this game's stake is control of the oil-tap, which is now the jugular of the western world. If there is a settlement, the United States may have time to avert Soviet control of the oil-tap by really drastic measures. If there is no settlement, and Israel is humbled, Soviet control of the oil-tap will be prompt and automatic. These are not pleasant thoughts.

© 1973. Los Angeles Times

Mid East

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400010048-9

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE 18 Nov 73 PAGE 1

War Was Hinted

By Michael Getler
Washington Post Staff Writer

A Central Intelligence Agency report late in September warned the White House of a strong possibility that war might soon break out in the Middle East, according to reliable sources.

The CIA evaluation, based mostly on unusually large Egyptian maneuvers near the Suez Canal, did not go so far as to predict flatly that an invasion was certain.

But the signs were viewed as sufficiently ominous to be immediately passed along at very high level to the Israelis.

Tel Aviv, however, reportedly disputed the American interpretation of Egyptian activity. Given the high esteem in which Israeli intelligence is held in Washington and the closeness of the Israelis to the would-be war zone, the Israeli assessment was quickly accepted here.

As late as Oct. 4, just two days before the war began, the joint U.S. Intelligence Board, made up of representatives from several intelligence agencies—including

See CIA, A8, Col. 1

CIA, From A1

CIA— took a common position that hostilities were unlikely, according to informants here. The readiness to accept the Israeli view, the failure to heed some unusual danger signals and the general surprise of the Arab attack has caused considerable post-war concern both within the administration and the intelligence community.

Within the Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency, it has been learned that the three top men—an Army colonel, Navy captain and senior civilian official—who headed the Middle East intelligence branch were transferred out of those jobs in the aftermath of the fighting.

At the same time, however, the existence of the earlier CIA warning, roughly one to two weeks before the fighting started, seems to suggest that the intelligence community was not totally as flat-footed at Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger indicated at his Oct. 15 press conference.

At that time, Kissinger said under questioning that "... all the intelligence at our disposal before Oct. 6) and all the intelligence given to us by foreign countries suggested that there was no possibility of the outbreak of a war."

Sources say there is no question that in the period between the end of September after the Israelis had challenged the CIA warning—and just a day or so before the war actually started, the United States had accepted the Israeli view that "they knew best" and there was no cause for alarm.

But Kissinger's assertion that the intelligence available suggested "no possibility of the outbreak of a war" is regarded by a number of senior officials both in and out of the intelligence field as an overstatement at the very least.

Aside from the CIA report, sources here suggest that other parts of the intelligence community such as the State Department, while not making outright predictions of warfare, were certainly expressing wariness.

The most difficult, and some say impossible, part of intelligence work, however, is the difference between gathering facts and estimating intentions. It is this difference that Kissinger sought to emphasize at an earlier Oct. 12 press conference when he was questioned about the apparent intelligence failure in not predicting the attack.

Kissinger said then that

both U.S. and Israeli intelligence had been aware of the pre-war build-up of forces in Egypt and Syria. He explained that Egyptian army maneuvers on the west side of the Suez Canal had been carried out during September in each of the last 10 years. He indicated that three times during the week preceding the war, assessments had been asked from U.S. and Israeli intelligence agencies and that each time they concluded that "hostilities were unlikely to the point of there being no chance of it."

Yet the earlier CIA report, which informants say was contained in the more highly classified version of agency reports that come to the attention of only certain officials, reportedly warned that the September maneuvers this year were different and more ominous than the past.

Informants say there were many more troops involved than in the past, more ammunition being used and stockpiled, a much greater logistics build-up and, perhaps most importantly, more field communications being hooked up and operated—something which occasionally can be listened in on by electronic sensors.

The transfer of officials within the Defense Intelligence Agency, according to one source, came about because of some strong objections voiced by these officials before the war started to the validity of these danger signals.

At his Oct. 12 press conference, Kissinger alluded to the "gravest danger of intelligence assessments"... the tendency to "fit the facts into existing preconceptions and to make them consistent with what is anticipated."

By and large, the prevailing view since the 1967 war had been that the Arab armies would never risk another humiliating defeat at the hands of Israel.

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400010048-9

NEW YORK TIMES

DATE 19 Nov 73

PAGE 7

SOVIET CARRIERS STIRRING CONCERN

New Ships Seen in West as
Altering Balance of Power

By DREW MIDDLETON

A second Soviet aircraft carrier is being built at Nikolayev on the Black Sea, and United States and British intelligence sources report that the Russians plan to construct carriers of another, larger class as part of their expanding naval program.

Naval sources in Washington and London felt that the growth of a Soviet carrier force represents a significant shift in the global balance of power. The Russians are said to be moving from a fleet built to frustrate American operations to one capable of projecting Soviet power across the oceans of the world.

Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., the Chief of Naval Operations, recently told the Senate Armed Services Committee that its members would see the day when the Soviet Union has a larger carrier fleet than the United States. The United States Navy has 15 carriers now but is reducing the number to 12.

First Carrier at Sea

The first Soviet aircraft carrier, the Kiev, is now on commissioning trials in the Black Sea. She has a displacement of approximately 45,000 tons and will carry 35 fixed-wing aircraft, probably the new Soviet Freehand vertical-take-off-and-landing fighters, and helicopters for antisubmarine warfare.

The second ship of the Kiev class, now under construction, is believed to be of about the same tonnage. In weight, the Soviet ships are closest to the American Essex class. The last of this class, the Bennington, was launched in 1944.

But the Kiev carriers, with greater speed and an armament of surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles, are a much more modern type of vessel.

Naval sources in Washington and in the capitals of the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are deeply concerned over the development of a Soviet carrier fleet.

U.S. Eliminating Old Ships

American naval authorities are especially worried because the development of Soviet sea power is occurring as the United States Navy is eliminating older ships and waiting for new ones. The years between now and 1980 are "critical" for American security, according to one highly placed source.

The present Soviet Navy, sources point out, was built in the nineteen-sixties to deny absolute control of the seas by the United States and its NATO allies. Soviet naval doctrine in those years did not aspire to control of the oceans in the sense that the United States has controlled them from 1945 until the present.

Soviet naval doctrine is changing, Western intelligence sources report, as the composition of the fleet changes.

Originally the deployment of cruisers and destroyers armed with surface-to-surface guided missiles gave the Russians the ability to knock out the carrier strike forces on which American surface strategy is based.

Former Strategy Defensive

At the same time, the Russians developed antisubmarine carriers, such as the Moskva and Leningrad of the Black Sea fleet, whose task was to keep American ballistic-missile submarines out of waters from which they could strike at Soviet industrial areas.

From this basically defensive strategy, the Russians have progressed to what one expert called "global capability."

This has been sought by the construction not only of the two Kiev carriers but also of three Kara-class cruisers. The latest of these, the Nikolayev, has "every available type of missile, gun, radar and electronic-warfare device," a British expert said.

Meanwhile, the Russian ballistic-missile submarine fleet has been reinforced by the deployment of the Delta class, which carries the SS-N-8 nuclear missile with a range of 4,000 nautical miles, and the construction of the Papa class, whose boats carry eight SS-N-7 cruise missiles.

A New Dimension

Naval spokesmen and intelligence analysts on both sides of the Atlantic are acutely aware that their reports on Soviet naval expansion and its consequences to the international power balance are often dismissed as veiled arguments for greater Western spending on new ships and weapons systems.

They insist, however, that the deployment of the Kiev, Karas and Deltas have added a new dimension of Soviet sea power, extending it into areas that until now have been regarded as in the American sphere of influence.

"Once their carriers are at sea in company with their other new ships," one qualified source said, "the Russians will be able to do what we did in Lebanon in 1958 and in Vietnam that will protect them against enemy air or submarines. Then we have a whole new ball game."

NEW YORK TIMES

DATE

21 NOV 73

PAGE

1

An Implied Soviet Threat Spurred U.S. Forces' Alert

Brezhnev Note on Acting Alone to Back Mideast Cease-Fire Led to Test of Wills Oct. 24-25, Washington Aides Say

By DAVID BINDER
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 20—The Soviet note that led to a precautionary alert of United States forces around the world on the night of Oct. 24 carried an implied threat rather than an actual threat of the dispatch of Soviet troops to the Suez war zone.

"We strongly urge that we both send forces to enforce the cease-fire and, if you do not, we may be obliged to consider acting alone," the Soviet note said, according to two officials who have read it.

A reconstruction of the cascading events of that night—many of which remain masked in secrecy—shows that the note from the Soviet leader, Leonid I. Brezhnev, to President Nixon and the alert ordered by the Nixon Administration were only two of a series of firm signals exchanged in a complicated test of wills over the Middle East.

The exchanges lasted more than 12 hours, according to interviews with United States officials and Soviet, Israeli and European diplomats, but the crucial exchange—delivery of the Brezhnev note and the calling of the alert—took place in less than an hour, approximately between 10:40 and 11:30 P.M.

The alert was put into effect by 2:30 A.M., Oct. 25, officials said, and formally authorized by President Nixon half an hour later.

Only hours before the arrival of the Brezhnev note, the Nixon Administration had rejected two earlier plans for a joint United States-Soviet expeditionary force to enforce peace on the Suez front.

The first had come from President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt in a message read over the Cairo radio at about 3 P.M. on Oct. 24. The next, in the form of a message from Mr. Brezhnev, had been delivered at about 8 P.M. to Secretary of State Kissinger by Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin.

The crisis that Mr. Kissinger faced had been building up for several days.

On Oct. 16, Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin, on a hasty visit to Egypt, discovered that the Egyptian Army, in contrast with President Sadat's boasts, was near a state of collapse. In addition, the Egyptian III Corps, on the east bank of the Suez Canal opposite the city of Suez, faced encirclement by the Israelis as a result of the Israeli crossing to the western bank early that morning.

Mr. Kosygin returned to Moscow Oct. 19 urging that the Soviet Government press for an immediate cease-fire in the Middle East war, which was then in its 14th day. Mr. Brezhnev thereupon invited President Nixon to send Mr. Kissinger to Moscow, and the Secretary arrived the next day.

In sessions Oct. 20 and 21, Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Brezhnev reached a compromise in which

Moscow won its point that no time could be lost in achieving a cease-fire, while the Americans won their point of that the cease-fire must be linked to negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis.

The joint cease-fire proposal they agreed upon was adopted by the United Nations Security Council early Oct. 22, and the truce in place officially went into effect about 12 hours later.

Mr. Kissinger stopped in Israel on that day on his way

home from Moscow. Four hours after he had left, Israeli forces went on to complete their encirclement of the Egyptian III Corps, an action he heard about later, reportedly with great dismay and a sense of betrayal.

While the Russians were said to have been outraged at what they regarded as a breach of their Oct. 21 understanding with the Americans, they also saw it as an opportunity to establish a large Soviet presence in the Middle East and they reportedly solicited President Sadat's Oct. 24 call for United States and Soviet troops.

A United States official familiar with the event said the original Brezhnev proposal on Oct. 24 for a joint United States-Soviet force for the Middle East made Mr. Kissinger apprehensive that tougher moments were ahead.

Mr. Kissinger was also getting what he later described as "puzzling" reports from the United Nations. There the Soviet representative, Yakov A. Malik, had shifted suddenly

from demanding a mere reaffirmation of the cease-fire resolution of Oct. 22—a reaffirmation was voted Oct. 23, and the new truce went into effect Oct. 24—to a resolution authorizing an expeditionary force for the Suez region, to a resolution authorizing a United States-Soviet expeditionary force.

The intelligence community, drawing principally on electronic surveillance of Soviet land, sea and air forces, had already noted the presence of seven landing craft and two ships with troop helicopters in eastern Mediterranean waters.

The landing craft had been there before, "milling around," as one intelligence official put it, recalling that a week before there had been eight landing craft in the same area.

Troop Standby Monitored

Electronic surveillance had also monitored signals putting seven divisions of Soviet air-borne troops — about 49,000 men — on a standby alert. One division had been placed on a higher level of alert during the day, making it ready to move out on call.

But, the intelligence official observed, there had been Soviet alerts before during the Middle East conflict, which began Oct. 6, and more Soviet landing craft in the region. So the activities of Soviet forces on Oct. 24 by themselves had caused no undue alarm at the Defense Department, one of the officials said.

Still the Soviet Air Force had pulled most of its large transports back from Damascus and Cairo to their home bases that day and some Pentagon officials interpreted this as a sign that Moscow might use them to take Soviet troops, rather than So-

viet weapons, to the Suez battle zone.

When the second Brezhnev note came at about 10:40 P.M. warning that the Soviet Union "may be obliged to consider acting alone," the responsible American officials—principally Secretary Kissinger and Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger—put that together with the electronic intelligence evidence and concluded that the Soviet Union was determined to put troops in the Middle East.

Suggestion to President

Describing the situation later, one of the Cabinet officials involved in the decision-making said of the second note and the intelligence estimates, "Either one, apart, we could have ignored."

Ambassador Dobrynin left the second note with Mr. Kissinger without obtaining a reply.

The Secretary of State immediately telephoned President Nixon, who was in his upper floor living quarters in the White House and suggested the United States response should be military as well as political, Mr. Nixon concurred.

This was the genesis of the United States alert.

President Nixon remained in charge throughout, his aides say, but he was also remote, staying the entire night in his study, receiving and relaying the telephone messages of Mr. Kissinger and Mr.

NEW YORK TIMES

DATE _____

PAGE _____

Schlesinger. Mr. Nixon empowered them to manage the crisis on their own, the Cabinet official said, leaving them to conceive and carry out the various moves.

Mr. Kissinger convened a meeting of what Mr. Schles-

inger later termed "the abbreviated National Security Council" in the austere, map-filled Situation Room in the White House basement.

It was abbreviated in part because the chairman of what had been a six-man panel, President Nixon, was upstairs. Mr. Kissinger was there in his dual capacity as Secretary of State and the President's assistant for national security affairs.

Another chair was empty because Spiro T. Agnew had resigned, and there was no director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness since George A. Lincoln had retired 14 months before.

"Officially the meeting consisted of Kissinger, Kissinger and Schlesinger," a council aide commented.

Attending as the intelligence adviser was William F. Colby, Director of Central Intelligence, whose agency had played a major role in handling the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 and was now on the sidelines. Mr. Colby had been called in belatedly.

The CIA was familiar with the electronic intelligence obtained by its powerful sister agency, the National Security Agency, but it was not apprised of the Soviet notes until Mr. Colby arrived at the White House.

Haig's Role Described

Attending as the military adviser was Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Schlesinger had been told of the second Soviet note by Alexander M. Haig Jr., chief of the White House staff. He, in turn, called Admiral Moorer. General Haig functioned more as a go-between than as a member of the decision-making group, aides said.

The abbreviated National

Security Council met at about 11 P.M., and Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Schlesinger swiftly agreed on a modified alert as the United States military response designed to persuade the Soviet Union against acting alone.

The technical term for the alert is Defense Condition 3, explained by a Pentagon official as "an order to stand by for further orders that may come." It is an order any area commander can issue without higher authority if he feels his forces may be threatened.

Mr. Schlesinger is said to have issued it at 11:30 P.M., and it was passed to the service chiefs by Admiral Moorer.

While the service chiefs were aware of the movements of Soviet military units, they were said to be so surprised by the diplomatic messages that they sent an aide to the C.I.A. and the State Department to seek further word on Soviet intentions. He apparently returned empty-handed.

The Washington order alerted most but not all United States forces. The Coast Guard, with its vital air-sea rescue system, was not brought in until 12 hours later. Strategic Air Command tanker planes hovering along the United States-to-Israel airlift route were left in their Middle Atlantic patterns rather than sent north for possible fueling of long-range B-52 bombers.

Mr. Schlesinger returned to the Pentagon about 1:30 A.M. to bolster the alert by ordering the aircraft carrier John F. Kennedy from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean with her A-4 fighter-bombers and telling the 15,000-man 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N. C., to get ready to board transport craft.

Asked if the Soviet Union had been notified of the alert,

a United States official said: "No, the alert itself was a signal which we knew they would get through their own electronic intelligence."

Heightened United States military activity could clearly be discerned through the amount and nature of the radio traffic, it was said.

Mr. Kissinger was busy, meanwhile, on the diplomatic front. He conferred repeatedly from the outset of the American-Soviet exchanges with Israel's Ambassador, Simcha Dinitz, advising him of Soviet and United States moves.

About 1 A.M. he told the British Ambassador, the Earl of Cromer, of the note and the alert. Other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were informed through the mechanism of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels, which was advised of the alert by the Defense Department about 2 A.M. Pentagon officials say the news went out to the alliance capitals much later because of a foul-up in the Brussels communication machinery.

In retrospect, however, associates of Mr. Kissinger acknowledge that the crisis-managers "botched" the job of promptly informing United States allies on the night's actions.

"We could have called up all the top allies," said a United States official. "But it might have meant delaying the alert."

Mr. Kissinger was also in touch with the United States delegate to the United Nations, John A. Scali, who had just been through some bruising exchanges with Mr. Malik.

The Soviet delegate had accused the United States of allowing Israel to violate the cease-fire of Oct. 22 and make territorial gains.

Through Mr. Scali, Mr. Kissinger was working to get the Soviet Union to agree to a new resolution in the Security Council setting up a peace-keeping force for the disputed Suez region.

Reply to Brezhnev Drafted

Finally, Mr. Kissinger drafted a reply to the last Brezhnev note saying the United States would not tolerate a unilateral action by the Soviet Union, hoped that Moscow would not take that course, and warned that any such move would damage the cause of peace. He also called for joint action in the United Nations.

That done, according to an aide, a weary Mr. Kissinger walked upstairs and reported to President Nixon and obtained his "ratification" of the moves, including the second note to Mr. Brezhnev. It was about 3 A.M. on Oct. 25, three and a half hours after the alert had been called.

At his news conference at noon, the Secretary publicly reminded Moscow that both the Soviet Union and the United States had nuclear arsenals "capable of annihilating humanity," but that they also had "a special duty to see to it that confrontations are kept within bounds."

An hour or so later, both countries joined in the 14-to-0 vote by which the United Nations Security Council decided to establish a United Nations peace-keeping force excluding the major powers—a move that in effect brought the American-Soviet exchanges to an end.

And in those exchanges, officials noted, the hot-line teletype machine that connects Washington and Moscow was never used.

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE Nov 12 PAGE 1

A-Arms Believed In Egypt

Scud Missiles Seen Under Soviet Control

By Michael Getler

Washington Post Staff Writer

The Soviet Union probably did ship nuclear weapons into Egypt during the October Arab-Israeli war, U.S. officials now believe.

These weapons are still believed to be in Egypt, though undoubtedly under strict Russian control.

The weapons are believed to be atomic warheads for mobile, Soviet-built "Scud" missiles, also shipped to Egypt at some point either before or during the Middle East fighting.

The "Shud" missiles have a range estimated at between 160 and 180 miles, long enough to bring Israeli cities within reach of these weapons if launched from the northeastern sectors of Egypt.

During the 18-day war, which began Oct. 6, there had been unconfirmed reports that the Soviets had shipped roughly 20 of these missiles into Egypt. Then, on Nov. 2, it was reported that U.S. intelligence was virtually certain that the Soviets had in fact sent the missiles to Egypt.

At the time, it was felt that the missiles were armed with conventional, high-explosive warheads, rather than atomic devices. At a meeting with newsmen that same day, however, a senior defense official—who asked not to be identified—was questioned about the presence of nuclear warheads and said only that there was "no confirmatory evidence" at that time.

U.S. officials familiar with the situation say there is still no way to be absolutely certain about the nuclear warheads, but that there now is "some evidence that something is there," and a more widespread feeling among senior intelligence officials that nuclear weapons were shipped.

Officials say the United States detected nuclear material being carried aboard some Soviet military supply ships moving from the Black Sea into the Mediterranean. By itself, this type of information is inconclusive because the Soviet Navy, like the U.S. Navy, carries nuclear weapons.

But at least one of these vessels reportedly did enter port in Egypt. Intelligence sources say, however, that this

See NUCLEAR, A16, Col. 1

vessel and possibly some others also showed signs of still having some nuclear material aboard when leaving port, and

they decline to discuss the details of whether measuring devices can detect if some material was unloaded from the ships or whether there is other evidence to support the

view that the warheads are in Egypt.

On Nov. 5, the magazine Aviation Week and Space Technology reported flatly that the Russians had sent two brigades of nuclear-armed "Scud" missiles to Egypt, and that the United States had satellite pictures to prove it.

U.S. officials say it is very difficult, if not impossible, to tell the difference between nuclear and conventional warheads from pictures—which they do not admit to having—though some of the support equipment could carry telltale signs.

These officials also say the evidence is still not as firm as the magazine article implies.

The most widely held estimate of Soviet intentions behind the missile shipments is that the Russians had to respond in some fashion to demands from Egyptian President Anwar Sadat for some more advanced offensive weaponry, and also to provide a balance to still-secret Israeli-built surface-to-surface missiles.

Despite official Israeli denials, U.S. intelligence sources say there is little doubt that Israel has developed and produced at least some of its own "Jericho" missiles with a range estimated at about 300 miles, enough to span the Sinai and reach deep into Egypt.

Israel is also widely believed to have the makings for a number of small atomic warheads.

The appearance of the "Scud" missiles in Egypt, even at the point when it was assumed they were armed with conventional warheads, caused considerable concern within the administration and some high-level communications with the Russians. This was because the missiles represented a potentially new level of long-range warfare and because the missiles were known to be at least capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE 26 NOV 73 PAGE oped

Joseph Alsop

'Frightening Facts'

The world we live in is no longer what it seems. Or at least, it is no longer what it seems to a large majority of thinking Americans. This is probably the most dangerous single feature of our current situation; and it was wonderfully vividly proven last week.

To begin with, a group of seven eminent Cambridge-based economists secured some enjoyable publicity by announcing that the Arab oil boycott ought to be countered with U.S. sanctions. Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger in fact hopes to use diplomatic pressures to move the Arab oil producers, prior to the coming negotiations for an Arab-Israeli settlement. But the seven economists were thinking of more direct sanctions, like the cessation of food deliveries.

Now this kind of direct sanctions, as even Cambridge-based economists ought to know, must ultimately depend on military power. Without military power, there is nothing whatever the United States can do to make the Arab oil states either hungry or otherwise uncomfortable—which is why the Arabs are so cocky.

By a splendid stroke of irony, the U.S. Navy's lonely little task force in the Indian Ocean turned tail and steamed for home on almost the same day the Cambridge economists issued their statement. This task force, headed by the aircraft carrier Hancock, had been sent from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean at the time of President Nixon's world-wide military alert. The Hancock is so ancient that it was about to be decommissioned and handed over to the ship-breakers when the order came to show the flag. By the time the Hancock and its few supporting vessels were called home from the Indian Ocean last week, the task force was also quite literally surrounded by Soviet guided missile cruisers of the most modern type, vastly more powerful and dangerous than the Hancock.

During the Yom Kippur war, the U.S. Navy also lost its parody of a naval base in the region of the Arabian peninsula—the slender facilities formerly available on the island of Bahrain in the Persian Gulf. Meanwhile, the Soviet Navy has a highly significant new naval base, UMM Qasr at the head of the Persian Gulf, plus a most important naval base with large supporting jet airfields in Somaliland, plus other useful facilities in the Indian Ocean.

These bases and other facilities permit the Soviet Navy to keep a permanent force of five important warships and 15 supporting vessels in the Indian Ocean, Red Sea and/or Persian Gulf, as the ships' orders may require. This is done, moreover, at the end of a supply line 11,000 miles long.

The reasons for this costly and difficult Soviet naval effort, finally, is quite certainly Soviet awareness of the overwhelming, even terrifying strategic importance of the Arab oil states. Hence one has to reach one of two conclusions about the Cambridge-based economists. Either they did not trouble to find out the foregoing unpleasant facts. Or else, perhaps, they are not quite in their right minds.

Even Cambridge economists, after all, if both sane and fully aware of the hard facts, could not really have believed the navally enfeebled United

States would get away with direct sanctions against the oil states in the Arabian peninsula. The Soviets, with their hard-bought naval superiority, would simply not stand for it.

Whether because of ignorance or self-delusion, in short, these extremely able men have demonstrably ceased to live in the real world. They are not alone, however. This reporter will bet 5-to-1 that just about all who have bothered to read this far will be both shocked and shaken by the following facts.

When the Soviets threatened military intervention in the Mideast, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were, of course, notified. The President warned the Soviets off, by putting part of SAC in the air and ordering his general alert. If the Soviets had ignored the President's warning, the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean would have been the first to feel the cruel shock. Thus the

U.S. Navy's general staff was duty bound to notify the President—and did so notify him—that the Sixth Fleet's marked inferiority would lead to rapid defeat in case of a fight.

The grim, unpublished episode speaks volumes, both about President Nixon's courage in a serious crisis, but also about the deterioration of the American situation, all around the world. It speaks volumes about changing Soviet attitudes, too, that the Soviets actually sent nuclear warheads to Egypt for a brief period at the same height of peril in the Mideast. The chances are that the warheads have since been taken away again; but it is fully confirmed that the warheads were actually sent.

These are frightening facts, from that real world in which most Americans have ceased to live. Further reports on it will follow, if a lull between more pressing horrors should permit.

© 1973, Los Angeles Times

NO DIRECT THREAT

Soviet Hint Sparked U.S. Alert

By David Binder

New York Times News Service

The Soviet note that led to a precautionary alert of U.S. forces around the Sinai on the night of Oct. 24 carried an implied threat more than an actual threat. The dispatch of Soviet troops to the Suez war zone. "We strongly urge that both sides send forces to enforce the cease-fire and, if they do not, we may be obliged to consider acting alone," the note said, according to two officials who read it.

RECONSTRUCTION of the events of that night — many of which remain secret — shows that the note from Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev to President Nixon and the alert itself were part of a series of firm moves exchanged in a test of wills over the Middle East. The exchanges lasted more than 12 hours, according to interviews with U.S. officials and Soviet, Israeli and European diplomats. The crucial exchange — delivery of the Brezhnev note and the calling of the alert — took place in less than an hour, approximately between 10:40 and 11:30 p.m. Only hours before, the Nixon administration had rejected two earlier pleas for a joint United States-Soviet expeditionary force to enforce peace on the Suez front.

THE FIRST had come from President Anwar Sadat of Egypt at about 3 a.m. The next, in the form of a note from Brezhnev, had been delivered at about 7 p.m. to Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger by Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin.

On Oct. 16, Premier Alexei N. Kosygin found during a visit that the Egyptian army, in contrast with Sadat's boasts, was near collapse. In addition, the Egyptian 3rd Army, on the east bank of the Suez Canal, faced encirclement by the Israelis.

Kosygin returned to Moscow on Oct. 19 and urged that the Soviet government press for an immediate cease-fire. Brezhnev thereupon invited Nixon to send Kissinger to Moscow, and the secretary arrived the next day.

ON OCT. 20 AND 21, Kissinger and Brezhnev reached a compromise in which Moscow won its point that no time could be lost in achieving a cease-fire, while the Americans won their point that the cease-fire must be linked to negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis.

Kissinger stopped in Israel on that day on his way home from Moscow. Four

hours after he had left, Israeli forces went on to complete their encirclement of the 3rd Army, an action he heard about later, reportedly with great dismay and a sense of betrayal.

While the Russians were said to have been outraged at what they regarded as a breach of their Oct. 21 understanding with the Americans, they also saw it as an opportunity to establish a large Soviet presence in the Middle East and they reportedly solicited Sadat's Oct. 24 call for U.S. and Soviet troops.

A U.S. OFFICIAL familiar with the event said the original Brezhnev proposal Oct. 24 for a joint U.S.-Soviet force for the Middle East made Kissinger apprehensive that tougher moments were ahead.

U.S. intelligence, drawing principally on electronic surveillance of Soviet land, sea and air forces, had already noted the presence of landing craft and ships with troop helicopters in the eastern Mediterranean.

Electronic surveillance had also monitored signals putting seven divisions of Soviet airborne troops — about 49,000 men — on a standby alert. One division had been placed on a higher level of alert during the day, making it ready to move out on call.

But, the intelligence official observed, there had been Soviet alerts before during the conflict, which began Oct. 6, and more Soviet landing craft in the re-

gion. So the activities on Oct. 24 had caused no undue alarm at the Defense Department.

BUT WHEN the second Brezhnev note came, the responsible American officials — principally Kissinger and Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger — concluded that the Soviet Union was determined to put troops in the Middle East.

Kissinger immediately telephoned Nixon, who was in his upper floor living quarters in the White House, and suggested the U.S. response should be military as well as political.

Nixon concurred, and this was the genesis of the U.S. alert.

Nixon, at an Oct. 26 news conference, said that Brezhnev's note "was very firm and it left very little to the imagination as to what he intended."

About 11 p.m., Kissinger convened a meeting of what Schlesinger later termed "the abbreviated National Security Council." Kissinger was in a dual capacity as Secretary of State and the President's assistant for national security affairs.

ATTENDING as the intelligence adviser was William E. Colby, director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, attended as military adviser.

Kissinger and Schlesinger swiftly agreed on a modified alert designed to persuade the Soviet Union against acting alone.

SCHLESINGER returned to the Pentagon about 1:30 a.m. to bolster the alert by ordering the aircraft carrier John F. Kennedy from the Atlantic into the Mediterranean with her A4 fighter-bombers and telling the 15,000-man 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., to get ready to load.

Kissinger was busy, meanwhile, on the diplomatic front. He conferred repeatedly from the outset with Israel's ambassador, Simcha Dinitz.

About 1 a.m. he told the British ambassador of the note and the alert, and other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were informed through the North Atlantic Council in Brussels, which was advised of the alert about 2 a.m. Pentagon officials say the news went out to the alliance capitals much later because of a foul-up in the Brussels communication machinery.

Kissinger was also in touch with the U.S. delegate to the United Nations, John A. Scal, who had just been through some bruising exchanges with the Soviet representative, Yakov A. Malik.

FINALLY, Kissinger drafted a reply to the last Brezhnev note saying the United States would not tolerate a unilateral action by the Soviet Union, hoped that Moscow would not take that course, and warned that any such move would damage the cause of peace. He also called for joint action in the United Nations.

That done, according to an aide, a weary Kissinger walked upstairs and reported to Nixon and obtained his "ratification" of the moves, including the second note to Brezhnev. It was about 3 a.m. on Oct. 25, three hours after the alert had been called.

Later that day both countries joined in the 14-0 vote by which the Security Council decided to establish a U.N. peacekeeping force excluding the major powers — a move that in effect brought the American-Soviet exchanges to an end.